

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated July 8, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested

Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1 and 5-10 have been amended.

I. Specification

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the objections to the Specification in view of the self-explanatory amendments presented above.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph in view of the self-explanatory amendments presented above.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sakamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,110) in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 7,072,571).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sakamoto in view of Suzuki fails to teach or suggest the recitation of claim 1 that “said selection means switches its selection from data in said second storage means to data in said first storage means at least at one frame which is closest to a frame which is at a timing when a special reproduction is required among the frames which are intra-frame re-encoded, and wherein the number of wholly intra-frame re-encoded frames included in the data selected from said re-encoded moving picture data is one”. As such, Applicant

respectfully submits that the references fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claim.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 would not have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sakamoto in view of Suzuki, because the references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features and limitations of the claims.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1 and claims 2-4 at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Applicant further respectfully submits independent claims 5, 9, and 10 are patentable over the cited combination for the same or similar reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 5, 9, and 10 and claims 6-8 at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 5.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
Application No.: 09/987,246

Attorney Docket No.: Q67253

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 5, 2009

/Logan J. Brown 58,290/
Logan J. Brown
Registration No. 58,290